

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

March 4, 2004

LR 209

we don't believe in it, we don't get any benefit from it, Lincoln is the only beneficiary, we won't support it, this body will have a clear direction, it seems to me, at that moment. We will learn something. And if Senator Aguilar is right, this ballot proposal will fail. That is what we'll learn. Now we won't...I won't be able to take it on Ray's statement alone. I'd like to have the public tell me that that's the case. But if what he says is widely held, then he has no fear by putting this before the public, because they'll defeat it. And when they defeat it, it seems to me, we can go back in and redivert those resources that we now have, and perhaps maybe move those to Grand Island, or liquidate them and turn them into something else. Senator Aguilar has a list that he'd like to spend money on, and I understand it. By the way, we all have a list that is different. I think what his argument is, is he just doesn't like the...this particular proposal, and that he'd like to substitute his will for what's before us. We're all tempted to do that, which is why, by the way, there's reason to create the discipline of using the constitution. Senator Thompson's argument was, is \$2 million enough to save the State Fair? And I think it's a fair question, and I think the fair answer is, no, don't think it is. I don't think \$2 million alone will save the State Fair. I think if the \$2 million is not accompanied by a serious revamping of our management, by a better promotion, by reading the public desire much more closely than has been done, without a local significant effort, rather like what Senator Smith put on the table, the State Fair will not, on the basis of \$2 million alone, achieve that. However, what the money does is to provide a stable spine of funding, funding that would be sufficiently clear, to my mind, that it, for example, would be able to support bonds, where you probably couldn't get a bonding mechanism without some kind of continuing source of money. And money that is simply based on ticket sales may not be sufficiently reliable to do that. Secondly, we all know the power of leveraging. Every one of our cities tells us, we need public-private partnerships. What we want is not total state support. We want a portion of state support upon which we may leverage the assistance of others so that they can see that the state is a stakeholder. And the \$2 million is that ability to leverage other funds. It also certainly spurs on local efforts, because it would be matched by that state effort. So while